

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND**

RAKIA PARKER, )  
                    )  
Plaintiff,       )  
                    )  
v.                  )     **Civil Action No. PJM-16-1052**  
                    )  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, )  
                    )  
Defendant.       )

**MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER**

Defendant, the United States of America, submits before this Court its Motion to Compel Discovery (“the Motion”) (ECF No. 13). Plaintiff Rakia Parker has not filed a response in opposition to the Motion. The Court has reviewed the Motion and applicable law. No hearing is deemed necessary. *See* Local Rule 105.6 (D. Md.). For the reasons presented below, the Court GRANTS IN PART the Motion.

**FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND**

The Court hereby adopts the factual and procedural background laid out in the Memorandum Opinion for this case dated December 20, 2016 (ECF No. 16). On December 20, 2016, the Court denied without prejudice the Motion for failure to comply with the requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a)(1) and Local Rule 104.7. Defendant filed a Certificate of Compliance with Local Rule 104.7 on January 3, 2017 (ECF No. 17), detailing Defendant’s attempts to confer with Plaintiff. The Certificate of Compliance satisfies both Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a)(1) and Local Rule 104.7, and the Motion has properly been filed.

## **DISCUSSION**

Defendant served Plaintiff with twenty-five (25) Interrogatories and twenty-four (24) Requests for Production of Documents (ECF No. 13, Ex.1-2). Defendant alleges the following: (1) “Plaintiff has failed to provide *any* responses to the Interrogatories served by Defendant on September 30, 2016;” (2) “Plaintiff supplied deficient responses to Requests for Production Nos. 2, 3, 6, 13, 18-19, 21, and 24;” and (3) “Plaintiff has not responded to Defendant’s request for her to sign a Medical Records Authorization” (ECF No. 17, p. 3-4).

### **I. Interrogatories**

The Court grants the Motion with respect to all requested Interrogatories except the following:

#### **Interrogatory No. 7**

The Court DENIES IN PART this request as being overbroad. The subject motor vehicle collision occurred in 2014. Defendant’s interrogatory is limited to a period of five years.

### **II. Request for Production of Documents**

The Court grants the Motion<sup>1</sup> with respect to all requested Production of Documents.

### **III. Medical Records Authorization**

The Court DENIES Defendant’s unnumbered request for Plaintiff to sign authorizations to release Plaintiff’s medical records. Plaintiff may elect to do so or produce responsive medical records. However, the failure to produce all responsive documents will likely result in adverse consequences regarding any hearings or at the trial on the merits.

---

<sup>1</sup> As modified by Defendant’s Certificate of Compliance (ECF No. 17).

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the foregoing, the Court GRANTS IN PART the Motion with the exceptions discussed above.

January 17, 2017

/s/  
Charles B. Day  
United States Magistrate Judge

CBD/xl